

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Aug. 11, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of May 11, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of May 11, 2005 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the three-month statutory period, no fee is believed due.

In paragraphs 1-13, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,085,159 to Ortega, *et al.* (hereinafter "Ortega") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,613 to Baker (hereinafter "Baker").

Independent Claims 1, 8, 11, and 12 have been amended to further emphasize certain aspects of the Applicant's invention. Dependent Claims 6, 10, and 17 have also been amended consistent with the amended independent claims. The amendments are fully supported in the specification, and no new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments

I. APPLICANT'S INVENTION

Applicant's invention is directed to a method and system for providing speech recognition system (SRS) information through a single view or frame, whose content can be dynamically updated in accordance with a trigger event within the SRS. In particular, the invention can provide a single floating window, the contents of which can be dynamically updated according to particular user inputs, actions, as well as the operational state of the SRS or speech-enabled application. Accordingly, the present

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Aug. 11, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of May 11, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

invention can significantly reduce screen clutter arising from the use of multiple windows while still providing users with needed information.

One embodiment of the invention is a method of dynamically displaying speech recognition system information. The method includes providing a single floating window for displaying frames of speech recognition system state information to a user, and dynamically varying the frames according to trigger events detected in the speech recognition system.

Each frame can differ from other frames according to the speech recognition system state information. The frames variably displayed in the single floating window can include a frame containing a list of valid speech recognition commands for a current speech recognition system state and a frame containing a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed. As explicitly described at p. 8, lines 22-24, and elsewhere in the specification, each variably displayed frame can be uniquely associated with a specific trigger event. Moreover, as described further described at p.7, lines 12-16 and elsewhere, at least one of the trigger events can be an automatic, user-independent event.

II. APPLICANT'S INVENTION DEFINES OVER THE REFERENCES

Applicant respectfully submits that Ortega and Baker, singly and combined, fail to disclose each feature of Applicant's invention. Ortega is directed to a method for

Appln. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Aug. 11, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of May 11, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

displaying voice commands with multiple variables in a speech application. At page 2 of the Office Action it is stated that Ortega displays frames according to trigger events detected in a speech recognition system. The trigger events described in Ortega, however, pertain to non-automatic or user-directed events such as in response to a user's issuing a STOP DICTION command or a user's enabling a program. (Col. 2, lines 12-16; lines 61-63.)

Ortega fails, however, to teach or suggest dynamically varying frames in response to trigger events that include at least one automatic, user-independent trigger event as recited in each of independent Claims 1, 8, 11, and 12, as amended. Baker, which is directed to speech recognition based on processing speech samples with at least two recognizers that each have different performance characteristics. Like Ortega, Baker fails to disclose the dynamic varying of frames in response to one or more of a plurality of trigger events that includes at least one automatic, user-independent trigger event.

Ortega similarly fails to teach or suggest at least one other feature of Applicant's invention. Ortega, for example, fails to teach or suggest dynamically varying frames wherein each is uniquely associated with a specific trigger event as also recited in each of independent Claims 1, 8, 11, and 12, as amended. Similarly, Baker fails to teach or suggest dynamically varying frames that are each uniquely associated with a specific trigger event.

Appin. No. 09/992,816
Amendment dated Aug. 11, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of May 11, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2001-0040 (285)

It follows that Ortega and Baker, individually and together, fail to teach or suggest each feature recited independent Claims 1, 8, 11, and 12, as amended. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that each of the independent claims thus defines over the prior art. Applicants respectfully submit, moreover, that whereas the remaining claims each depend from one of these claims while reciting additional features, the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 11, 2005



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000